Dear Jim, C.A. 82-0754 10/25/84

I've finished reading the Dube 1012/84 affidavit, Briggs Vaughn and attached records. I've not checked the disclosed assassinations plots record against the index, assuming that you will, because if it is included Dube has sworn falsely on it after its official disclosure that he, himself, undertook to explain under oath. *

After the doctoral candidate finished his work and left and after I returned from the doctor (numbness in left arm and hand he attributes to pinched nerve) I made a few notes that I'll enclose after I read and correct them. **

There is ambiguity regarding the person who in 7/66 was writing a book about the assassination. With loose reference it could mean someone who was working on a book already written and thus refer to someone other than me. Why not ask the lawyer if it means me? This does not involve any disclosure and you might get an answer. ***

Some of these documents are elliptical, less than definitive, evasive, etc. Some of the claims are at least unnecessary and probably unjustified. At no point is there any indication of any effort to learn if what was withheld had been made public and it is probable that some was. I think I've indicated some.

It would have been better if Bud had made some effort in 1977.

At several points I note existence of other relevant and interesting records but not all of them. Someone might want to ask for them, esp. for what CI did.

I'll send copies to Paul when I mail this. I'm knocking off for the night, beginning with supper, because I've not felt quite right, perhaps from apprehension. ****

I had an interesting and encouraging conversation with Lynch, who may have phoned before he had lunch. He was careful to say he is not predicting victory and to indicate areas of possible defeat. But he was encouraged by the attitude of the panel and the grant of a little extra time. I think he was also friendly, and he expressed his interest in and appreciation of the memo I sent him on New Deal lawyers I knew and said he planned to accept my invitation to come up with his family some weekend. He said you might have a more impartial report on the business. I have the impression that he did very well and that he did all that I asked that was, under the circumstanxes, appropriate. It would not have been appropriate for him to raise the matter of the gross lie, that I was "closely observed" in some kind of terrible deeds, because what is in our briefs is undenied. Thus he could have used the time better on other things, as he did not say but I believe.

* Not to have been included in this Vaughn, I was wrong.
**Has taught college full time, is teaching part-time while working on thesis.
*** See enclosed memo
**** PH: In The Kennedy Loyalist Barber has a facsimile of an FBI TT. It bears no file # and I wonder about it. Do you know its antecedents? I do notmwwant to start any correspondence with them. But as you811 see from the enclosed, copies of which I gave you years ago, some such communication was required. I've never seen so many typos in an FBI record as Barber prints. It this what Walter reconstructed?

Best,

Harold